arXiv:1703.06798v1 [math.OA] 20 Mar 2017

ENDOMORPHISMS OF THE CUNTZ ALGEBRAS AND THE THOMPSON GROUPS

SELÇUK BARLAK, JEONG HEE HONG, AND WOJCIECH SZYMAŃSKI

ABSTRACT. We investigate the relationship between endomorphisms of the Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_2$ and endomorphisms of the Thompson groups F, T and V represented inside the unitary group of $\mathcal{O}_2$. For an endomorphism λ_u of $\mathcal{O}_2$, we show that $\lambda_u(V) \subseteq V$ if and only if $u \in V$. If λ_u is an automorphism of $\mathcal{O}_2$ then $u \in V$ is equivalent to $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq V$. Our investigations are facilitated by introduction of the concept of modestly scaling endomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_n$, whose properties and examples are investigated.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Thompson groups F, T and V (see [13], [4]) are among the most mysterious and most intensly studied discrete groups. We want to exploit the natural representation of these groups inside the unitary group of the Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_2$ (see [3], [14]) and initiate a line of investigations aimed at better understanding of their internal symmetries provided by endomorphisms and automorphisms. It should be noted that this relation between the Thompson groups and the Cuntz algebras has been exploited recently by Uffe Haagerup and his collaborators in their work on amenability and other analytic properties of the Thompson groups, see [9] and [10].

The central question we ask in this paper is the following.

Question. Which unital $*$-endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_2$ preserve the Thompson groups globally?

Recall from [8] that every such endomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_2$ is of the form λ_u for some unitary $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$. Our main result, Theorem 3.21, says that $\lambda_u(V) \subseteq V$ if and only if $u \in V$. Under the weaker assumptions that $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq V$ or $\lambda_u(T) \subseteq V$, we are not able to conclude that $u \in V$ without additional conditions, explained in Propositions 3.19 and 3.20. However, as shown in Theorem 3.12, if $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq V$ and λ_u is an automorphism of $\mathcal{O}_2$ then the unitary u must belong to group V.

Note also that it is quite possible that endomorphism (or automorphism) λ_u of $\mathcal{O}_2$ globally preserves the Thompson group F, while the unitary u does not belong to F — the flip-flop automorphism of $\mathcal{O}_2$ is one such example. The non-trivial combinatorial question of determining those unitaries $u \in V$ for which $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq F$ is taken up in [1].

In the course of these investigations, we have discovered a useful technical condition on endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$, which we call *modest scaling* (Definition 3.1). This condition is automatically satisfied by all automorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$ as well as by those unital endomorphisms

Date: March 21, 2017.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20E36, 46L05, 46L40.

Key words and phrases. Thompson's groups, Cuntz algebra, endomorphism.

Jeong Hee Hong was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (Grant No. 2016R1D1A1B03930839). Selçuk Barlak and Wojciech Szymański were partially supported by the Villum Fonden Research Project 'Local and global structures of groups and their algebras' (2014–2018).

preserving the core UHF-subalgebra $\mathcal{F}_n$ of $\mathcal{O}_n$ (Proposition 3.3). Modest scaling is a non-commutative analogue of the topological property of a continuous surjection of a compact space that the preimage of every point has empty interior (Remark 3.2).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **The Thompson groups.** The Thompson group F is the group of order preserving piecewise linear homeomorphisms of the closed interval $[0,1]$ onto itself that are differentiable except finitely many dyadic rationals and such that all slopes are integer powers of 2. This group has a presentation

$$F = \langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n, \dots \mid x_j x_i = x_i x_{j+1}, \forall i < j \rangle.$$

Remarkably, it admits a finite presentation as well

$$F = \langle A, B \mid [AB^{-1}, A^{-1}BA] = 1,\ [AB^{-1}, A^{-2}BA^2] = 1 \rangle.$$

These two are connected by setting $x_0 = A$ and $x_n = A^{-(n-1)}BA^{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$.

We will also consider the Thompson groups T and V. The latter consists of possibly discontinuous bijections of the interval $[0,1]$ that are piecewise linear with slopes integer powers of 2 and with finitely many points of discontinuity and non-differentiability. We have $F \subseteq T \subseteq V$.

For a good introduction to the Thompson groups we refer the reader to [4] and [2] and the references therein.

2.2. **The Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_n$.** If n is an integer greater than 1, then the Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_n$ is a unital, simple, purely infinite C^*-algebra generated by n isometries $S_1, \dots, S_n$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n S_i S_i^* = 1$, [7]. We denote by W_n^k the set of k-tuples $\mu = \mu_1 \dots \mu_k$ with $\mu_m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and by W_n the union $\cup_{k=0}^\infty W_n^k$, where $W_n^0 = \{\emptyset\}$. We call elements of W_n multi-indices. If $\mu \in W_n^k$ then $|\mu| = k$ is the length of μ. If $\mu = \mu_1 \dots \mu_k \in W_n$ then $S_\mu = S_{\mu_1} \dots S_{\mu_k}$ ($S_\emptyset = 1$ by convention) is an isometry with range projection $P_\mu = S_\mu S_\mu^*$. We say that $\mu, \nu \in W_n$ are orthogonal if $P_\mu P_\nu = 0$. Every word in $\{S_i, S_i^* \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ can be uniquely expressed as $S_\mu S_\nu^*$, for $\mu, \nu \in W_n$ [7, Lemma 1.3].

We denote by $\mathcal{F}_n^k$ the C^*-subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_n$ spanned by all words of the form $S_\mu S_\nu^*$, $\mu, \nu \in W_n^k$, which is isomorphic to the matrix algebra $M_{n^k}(\mathbb{C})$. The norm closure $\mathcal{F}_n$ of $\cup_{k=0}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n^k$ is isomorphic to the UHF-algebra of type n^∞, called the *core UHF-subalgebra* of $\mathcal{O}_n$, [7]. We denote by τ the unique normalized trace on $\mathcal{F}_n$. The core UHF-subalgebra $\mathcal{F}_n$ is the fixed-point algebra for the gauge action $\gamma : U(1) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}_n)$, such that $\gamma_z(S_j) = zS_j$ for $z \in U(1)$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$. We denote by $\Phi_\mathcal{F}$ the faithful conditional expectation from $\mathcal{O}_n$ onto $\mathcal{F}_n$ given by averaging with respect to the normalized Haar measure:

$$\Phi_\mathcal{F}(x) = \int_{z \in U(1)} \gamma_z(x) dz.$$

The C^*-subalgebra of $\mathcal{O}_n$ generated by projections P_μ, $\mu \in W_n$, is a MASA (maximal abelian $*$-subalgebra) in $\mathcal{O}_n$. We call it the *diagonal* and denote $\mathcal{D}_n$. The spectrum of $\mathcal{D}_n$ is naturally identified with X_n — the full one-sided n-shift space. Furthermore, there exists a unique faithful conditional expectation $\Phi_\mathcal{D}$ from $\mathcal{O}_n$ onto $\mathcal{D}_n$ such that

$$\Phi_\mathcal{D} = \Phi_\mathcal{D} \circ \Phi_F$$

and $\Phi_\mathcal{D}(S_\alpha S_\beta^*) = 0$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in W_n$ such that $\alpha \neq \beta$.

We need to introduce the following notation, for use later in the paper. Let $q \in \mathcal{D}_n$ be a non-zero projection. Then q admits a unique representation $q = \sum_{j=1}^r P_{\mu_j}$ with minimal $r \geq 1$

among all representations for q as a finite sum of projections of the form P_μ, $\mu \in W_n$. In the following, we call this representation the *standard form* for q. We set

$$\min(q) := \min\left\{ |\mu_j| \mid q = \sum_{j=1}^{r} P_{\mu_j} \text{ standard form} \right\}.$$

In what follows, we will consider elements of $\mathcal{O}_n$ of the form $w = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\alpha S_\beta^*$, where $\mathcal{J}$ is a finite collection of pairs (α, β) in $W_n \times W_n$. The collection of all such elements will be denoted $\mathcal{V}_n$, that is

$$\mathcal{V}_n = \left\{ w \in \mathcal{O}_n \mid w = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\alpha S_\beta^* \right\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{V}_n$ is a $*$-subring of $\mathcal{O}_2$. We put $\mathcal{J}_1 = \{\alpha \mid \exists(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{J}\}$ and $\mathcal{J}_2 = \{\beta \mid \exists(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{J}\}$. Of course, such a presentation of an element of $\mathcal{V}_n$ is not unique.

We denote by $\mathcal{S}_n$ the group of unitaries in $\mathcal{V}_n$, that is those unitaries in $\mathcal{O}_n$ of the form $\sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\alpha S_\beta^*$. Such a sum is a unitary if and only if $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{J}_1} P_\alpha = 1 = \sum_{\beta\in\mathcal{J}_2} P_\beta$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{S}_n$ is contained in the normalizer of $\mathcal{D}_n$ in $\mathcal{O}_n$,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{O}_n}(\mathcal{D}_n) = \{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_n) \mid u\mathcal{D}_n u^* = \mathcal{D}_n\}.$$

For a unital $*$-subalgebra A of $\mathcal{O}_n$, we denote by $\mathcal{U}(A)$ the group of unitary elements of A and by $\mathcal{P}(A)$ the set of projections in A.

2.3. **Endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$.** As shown by Cuntz in [8], there exists a bijective correspondence between unitaries in $\mathcal{O}_n$ and unital $*$-endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$, determined by

$$\lambda_u(S_i) = uS_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Such maps λ_u will be called endomorphisms for short, and the collection of all of them will be denoted $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_n)$. Note that composition of endomorphisms corresponds to the 'convolution' multiplication of unitaries: $\lambda_u \circ \lambda_w = \lambda_{\lambda_u(w)u}$. In the case $u, w \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{F}_n^1)$ or $u, w \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D}_n)$, this formula simplifies to $\lambda_u \circ \lambda_w = \lambda_{uw}$. For all $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ we have $\mathrm{Ad}(u) = \lambda_{u\varphi(u^*)}$. Here φ denotes the canonical shift on the Cuntz algebra:

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i x S_i^*, \quad x \in \mathcal{O}_n.$$

2.4. **Representations of the Thompson groups in $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$.** As shown in [3] and [14], the Thompson group F has a natural faithful representation in the unitary group of $\mathcal{O}_2$ by those unitaries $u = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\alpha S_\beta^*$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$ that the association $\mathcal{J}_1 \ni \alpha \mapsto \beta \in \mathcal{J}_2$ (with $(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{J}$) respects the lexicographic order on W_2. We have

$$x_0 = S_1 S_1 S_1^* + S_1 S_2 S_1^* S_2^* + S_2 S_2^* S_2^*,$$
$$x_k = 1 - S_2^k S_2^{*k} + S_2^k x_0 S_2^{*k}, \quad \text{for } k \geq 1.$$

The subgroup of $\mathcal{S}_2$ generated by F and $S_2 S_2 S_1^* + S_1 S_1^* S_2^* + S_2 S_1 S_2^* S_2^*$ is isomorphic to the Thompson group T, and consists of those unitaries $u = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\alpha S_\beta^*$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$ that the association $\mathcal{J}_1 \ni \alpha \mapsto \beta \in \mathcal{J}_2$ (with $(\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{J}$) respects the lexicographic order on W_2 up to a cyclic permutation.

Finally, group $\mathcal{S}_2$ itself is isomorphic to the Thompson group V and it will be denoted in this way throughout the remainder of this paper. We have $V = \mathcal{V}_2 \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$.

We note that the Thompson group F is invariant under the canonical shift φ on $\mathcal{O}_2$. Furthermore, it is quite possible that $\lambda_u(F) = F$ for an automorphism λ_u of $\mathcal{O}_2$, even though the

unitary u may not belong to group F. The simplest example is the flip-flop automorphism $\lambda_u(S_1) = S_2$, $\lambda_u(S_2) = S_1$, where the corresponding unitary $u = S_1S_2^* + S_2S_1^*$ is inside group T but not in F.

3. The main results

3.1. **Modestly scaling endomorphisms.** In this subsection, we introduce a certain class of endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$, called modestly scaling, that will also play a role in our considerations of endomorphisms preserving the Thompson groups.

Definition 3.1. An endomorphism $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ is called *modestly scaling* if the following property is satisfied. For every sequence (ν_k) of non-empty multi-indices in W_n, if $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ such that $p \leq \alpha(P_{\nu_1\dots\nu_k})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then $p = 0$.

Remark 3.2. Suppose that $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ is such that $\alpha(\mathcal{D}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_n$. Let $\alpha_* : X_n \to X_n$ be the corresponding continuous surjection of the spectrum of $\mathcal{D}_n$. If α is modestly scaling then for every point $x \in X_n$ the inverse image $\alpha_*^{-1}(x)$ has an empty interior or, equivalently, α_* is not constant on any open subset of X_n.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_n)$. Then α is modestly scaling if one of the following conditions holds:*

(i) *α is an automorphism of $\mathcal{O}_n$;*
(ii) *$\alpha(\mathcal{F}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$.*

Proof. Let (ν_k) be a sequence of non-empty multi-indices in W_n and set $\mu_k = \nu_1 \dots \nu_k$. Let $p \in \mathcal{O}_n$ be a projection such that $p \leq \alpha(P_{\mu_k})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Ad (i). Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}_n)$. Since $\alpha^{-1}(p) \leq P_{\mu_k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha^{-1}(p)) \leq P_{\mu_k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha^{-1}(p)) = 0$ and therefore also $p = 0$, as $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}$ is faithful.

Ad (ii). Due to the uniqueness of trace on the UHF-algebra $\mathcal{F}_n$, we have

$$\tau(\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}(p)) \leq \tau(\alpha(P_{\mu_k})) = \tau(P_{\mu_k})$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\tau(P_{\mu_k}) \overset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ and τ is faithful, we get that $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}(p) = 0$. Hence $p = 0$, as $\Phi_{\mathcal{F}}$ is faithful. □

Remark 3.4. As shown already by Cuntz in [8], if u is a unitary inside the core UHF-subalgebra $\mathcal{F}_n$ then automatically the corresponding endomorphism λ_u globally preserves $\mathcal{F}_n$. However, it should be noted that there exist unitaries $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ which do not belong to $\mathcal{F}_n$ for which nevertheless we have $\lambda_u(\mathcal{F}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$. Such exotic endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$ have been thoroughly investigated in [5], [11] and [12].

For those endomorphisms which globally preserve the diagonal MASA $\mathcal{D}_n$, the following proposition gives a useful criterion of modest scaling for an endomorphism.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ be such that $\alpha(\mathcal{D}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_n$. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *endomorphism α is modestly scaling;*
(ii) *for every sequence of non-empty multi-indices (ν_k) in W_n we have*

$$\min(\alpha(P_{\nu_1\dots\nu_k})) \overset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \infty.$$

Proof. Let (ν_k) be a sequence of non-empty multi-indices in W_n. Set $\mu_k = \nu_1 \dots \nu_k$.

(i)⇒(ii). Assume that α is modestly scaling. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that sequence $\min(\alpha(P_{\mu_k}))$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is bounded. Observe that this sequence is monotonely increasing, as $\alpha(P_{\mu_{k+1}}) \leq \alpha(P_{\mu_k})$ for all k, and therefore eventually stabilizes. It is not difficult to see that

there exists a non-empty multi-index $\kappa \in W_n$ such that $|\kappa| = \sup_k\{\min(\alpha(P_{\mu_k}))\}$ and with the property that $P_\kappa \leq \alpha(P_{\mu_k})$ for all k. This contradicts the fact that α is modestly scaling.

(ii)⇒(i). Let $p \in \mathcal{O}_n$ be a projection such that $p \leq \alpha(P_{\mu_k})$ for all k. Hence $0 \leq \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(p) \leq \alpha(P_{\mu_k})$. Assume that $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(p) \neq 0$ and find some $\sigma \in W_n$ and $t > 0$ such that $tP_\sigma \leq \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(p)$. By assumption, $\min(\alpha(P_{\mu_k})) > |\sigma|$ for sufficiently large k, so that $tP_\sigma \leq \alpha(P_{\mu_k})$ is not possible for such k. This is a contradiction. Hence $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(p) = 0$ and thus $p = 0$ by faithfulness of $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}$. □

There exist endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$ which are not modestly scaling, and the following proposition provides one way for constructing such examples. Here for $k \geq 1$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we denote by $i(k) \in W_n^k$ the multi-index of length k consisting only of i's.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $k \geq 1$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Let $v \in \mathcal{O}_n$ be a partial isometry with $v^*v = 1 - P_{i(k+1)}$ and $vv^* = 1 - P_{i(k)}$. We put $w = v + S_{i(k)}S_{i(k+1)}^*$, a unitary in $\mathcal{O}_n$. Then $P_{i(k)} \leq \lambda_w(P_{i(r)})$ for all $r \geq 1$. In particular, λ_w is not modestly scaling.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $r \geq 1$. Using $vP_{i(k+1)} = 0$, one computes for $r = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_w(P_i) &= wP_iw^* \\ &= vP_iv^* + vP_iS_{i(k+1)}S_{i(k)}^* + S_{i(k)}S_{i(k+1)}^*P_iv^* + S_{i(k)}S_{i(k+1)}^*P_iS_{i(k+1)}S_{i(k)}^* \\ &= vP_iv^* + P_{i(k)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $P_{i(k)} \leq \lambda_w(P_i)$. Assume now that $P_{i(k)} \leq \lambda_w(P_{i(r)})$. Then there exists some projection $p \in \mathcal{O}_n$ such that $\lambda_w(P_{i(r)}) = p + P_{i(k)}$. Using again that $vP_{i(k+1)} = 0$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_w(P_{i(r+1)}) &= wS_i\lambda_w(P_{i(r)})S_i^*w^* \\ &= wS_ipS_i^*w^* + wS_iP_{i(k)}S_i^*w^* \\ &= wS_ipS_i^*w^* + S_{i(k)}S_{i(k+1)}^*P_{i(k+1)}S_{i(k+1)}S_{i(k)}^* \\ &= wS_ipS_i^*w^* + P_{i(k)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $P_{i(k)} \leq \lambda_w(P_{i(r)})$ for all $r \geq 1$, by the principle of mathematical induction. Consequently, λ_w does not satisfy Definition 3.1 and hence it is not modestly scaling. □

Proposition 3.6 shows that many unitaries in $\mathcal{S}_n$ yield endomorphisms that are not modestly scaling. Particular instances are the generators x_k, $k \geq 0$, of the Thompson group F. It is conceivable that many unitaries in F lead to endomorphisms which are not modestly scaling. However, one should notice that for any $u \in F$, the element $u\varphi(u)^* \in F$ corresponds to an inner automorphism $\lambda_{u\varphi(u)^*} = \mathrm{Ad}(u)$ of $\mathcal{O}_2$, which is modestly scaling.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_n)$, $x \in \mathcal{O}_n$, and $\mu, \nu \in W_n$ be such that $x\alpha(S_\mu) = x\alpha(S_\nu) \neq 0$. Then $P_\mu P_\nu \neq 0$. Moreover, if α is modestly scaling then $\mu = \nu$.*

Proof. Let $x\alpha(S_\mu) = x\alpha(S_\nu) \neq 0$. Then

$$0 \neq x\alpha(S_\mu S_\mu^*)x^* = x\alpha(S_\nu S_\nu^*)x^* \geq 0,$$

and hence,

$$0 \neq x\alpha(P_\mu)x^*x\alpha(P_\nu)x^* \leq \|x^*x\|x\alpha(P_\mu P_\nu)x^*.$$

This shows that $P_\mu P_\nu \neq 0$.

Assume now that α is modestly scaling. Since $P_\mu P_\nu \neq 0$, we may assume without loss of generality that there exists a $\kappa \in W_n$ such that $\nu = \mu\kappa$. Also, suppose by way of contradiction, that $\mu \neq \nu$, that is, $\kappa \neq \emptyset$. Set $y = \alpha(S_\mu)^*x^*x\alpha(S_\mu)$ and observe that $y = \alpha(P_{\mu\kappa^\ell})y\alpha(P_{\mu\kappa^\ell})$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Here $\kappa^\ell \in W_n$ denotes the concatenation of ℓ copies of κ. As the Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_n$ is purely infinite and simple, we find a non-zero projection $p \in \mathcal{O}_n$ with $||y||p \leq y$. Then $p \leq \alpha(P_{\mu\kappa^\ell})$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. As α is modestly scaling, we conclude that $p = 0$, which is a contradiction. This yields $\mu = \nu$, and the proof is complete. □

Definition 3.8. For $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ we denote $\mathbf{1}_w = \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(w)$. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{1}_w$ is the maximal projection in $\mathcal{D}_n$ such that $w = \mathbf{1}_w + (1 - \mathbf{1}_w)w$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_n)$ and $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ be such that $\alpha(w) \in \mathcal{S}_n$. Then $\alpha(\mathbf{1}_w) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}$. If α is modestly scaling then $\alpha(\mathbf{1}_w) = \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}$.*

Proof. As $\alpha(w) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, there exists a finite set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} \subseteq W_n \times W_n$ such that $\alpha(w) = \sum_{(\mu,\nu)\in\tilde{\mathcal{J}}} S_\mu S_\nu^*$. We have that

$$\alpha(\mathbf{1}_w) = \alpha(\mathbf{1}_w)\alpha(w) = \alpha(\mathbf{1}_w) \sum_{(\mu,\nu)\in\tilde{\mathcal{J}}} S_\mu S_\nu^*,$$

and thus, $\alpha(\mathbf{1}_w)S_\mu = \alpha(\mathbf{1}_w)S_\nu$ for $(\mu,\nu) \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$. By Lemma 3.7, we therefore get that if $\alpha(\mathbf{1}_w)S_\mu \neq 0$, then $\mu = \nu$. Thus, $\alpha(\mathbf{1}_w) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}$.

Now assume that α is modestly scaling. Write $w = \sum_{(\kappa,\sigma)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\kappa S_\sigma^*$ for some finite set $\mathcal{J} \subseteq W_n \times W_n$. Using that $\alpha(w) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, we can argue as before to deduce $\mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(S_\kappa) = \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(S_\sigma)$ for all $(\kappa,\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}$. It follows from Lemma 3.7 that $\mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(S_\kappa) \neq 0$ implies $\kappa = \sigma$. This shows that $\mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)} \leq \alpha(\mathbf{1}_w)$. □

3.2. **Endomorphisms globally preserving the Thompson groups.** In this subsection, we investigate which endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_2$ globally preserve the Thompson groups, in terms of the corresponding unitaries of $\mathcal{O}_2$.

Remark 3.10. We notice that for any given projection $p \in \mathcal{D}_2$ there exists a unitary $w \in F$ such that $p = \mathbf{1}_w$. Indeed, if $1 - p = \sum_{j=1}^m P_{\mu_j}$, then $w = p + \sum_{j=1}^m S_{\mu_j} x_0 S_{\mu_j}^* \in F$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{1}_w = \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(w) = p + \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(S_{\mu_j} x_0 S_{\mu_j}^*) = p.$$

Combining Proposition 3.9 and Remark 3.10, we immediately obtain the following.

Corollary 3.11. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ be modestly scaling and such that $\alpha(F) \subseteq V$. Then $\alpha(\mathbf{1}_w) = \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}$ for all $w \in F$, and hence $\alpha(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2$.*

Now, we are ready to prove the first main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.12. *Let $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ be such that $\lambda_u \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ and $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq V$. Then $u \in V$.*

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ be such that $\lambda_u \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ and $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq V$. Then $\lambda_u(\mathcal{D}_2) = \mathcal{D}_2$ by Proposition 3.3 and Corollary 3.11. Thus $u \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{O}_2}(\mathcal{D}_2)$ by [8]. As shown in [15] and [6], this implies that $\lambda_u = \lambda_v \circ \lambda_d$ for some $v \in V$ and $d \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D}_2)$ with both λ_v and λ_d automorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_2$.

Suppose, by way of contradiction, that $d \neq 1$. Let $t \neq 1$ be a scalar of modulus one in the spectrum of d. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $|n - t| \geq \varepsilon$ for all non-negative integers n. Find a non-empty multi-index $\beta \in W_2$ and a partial unitary $x \in \mathcal{D}_2$ with support and range projection $1 - P_\beta$ such that $\|tP_\beta + x - d\| < \varepsilon$.

Denote by $\tilde{\beta} \in W_2$ the unique multi-index such that $\beta = \beta_1\tilde{\beta}$ with $|\beta_1| = 1$. It is not difficult to show that there exists some partial isometry $y \in \mathcal{V}_2$ such that $w = S_{\beta 12}S_{\tilde{\beta}12}^* + y \in F$. One computes

$$\lambda_d(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12}) = \lambda_d(S_{\beta 12}S_{\tilde{\beta}12}^*) = \lambda_d(S_{\beta_1}P_{\tilde{\beta}12}) = dS_{\beta_1}P_{\tilde{\beta}12} = dS_{\beta 12}S_{\tilde{\beta}12}^*,$$

from which it follows that $\|\lambda_d(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12}) - tS_{\beta 12}S_{\tilde{\beta}12}^*\| < \varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\|\lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12}) - tvS_{\beta_1}\lambda_v(P_{\tilde{\beta}12})\| = \|\lambda_v(\lambda_d(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12}) - tS_{\beta 12}S_{\tilde{\beta}12}^*)\| < \varepsilon.$$

As $v \in V$, it holds that $y := vS_{\beta_1}\lambda_v(P_{\tilde{\beta}12}) \in \mathcal{V}_2$. Find some finite set $\mathcal{J} \subseteq W_2 \times W_2$ such that $y = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\alpha S_\beta^*$. For $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{J}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(S_\beta S_\alpha^* \lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12})) - tP_\beta\| &= \|\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(S_\beta S_\alpha^* \lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12})) - \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(tS_\beta S_\alpha^* y))\| \\ &\leq \|S_\beta S_\alpha^*(\lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12}) - ty)\| \\ &< \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\chi : \mathcal{D}_2 \to \mathbb{C}$ be any character satisfying $\chi(P_\beta) = 1$. Then

$$|\chi(\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(S_\beta S_\alpha^* \lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12}))) - t| < \varepsilon.$$

By the choice of $\varepsilon > 0$, we get that $\chi(\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(S_\beta S_\alpha^* \lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12})))$ cannot be a non-negative integer. On the other hand, $S_\beta S_\alpha^* \lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12}) \in \mathcal{V}_2$ by assumption. Hence, $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(S_\beta S_\alpha^* \lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12})) \in \mathcal{V}_2 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$ is a finite sum of projections in $\mathcal{D}_2$. This implies that $\chi(\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(S_\beta S_\alpha^* \lambda_u(wP_{\tilde{\beta}12})))$ is a non-negative integer, which is a contradiction. Hence, $d = 1$ and thus $u = v \in V$, as required. □

By Theorem 3.12 above, if $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ restricts to an automorphism of one of the Thompson groups F, T, or V, then $\alpha = \lambda_u$ for some $u \in V$.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ and $\mu, \nu \in W_2$ be non-empty, orthogonal multi-indices. Assume there exists some $w \in V$ such that $P_\mu \leq \mathbf{1}_w$, $P_\nu w P_\nu = 0$, and $\alpha(w) \in V$. Then $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))\alpha(P_\nu) = 0$.*

Proof. Write $w = \sum_{(\kappa,\sigma)\in\mathcal{J}} S_\kappa S_\sigma^*$ for some finite set $\mathcal{J} \subseteq W_2 \times W_2$. Without loss of generality we may assume that there exists $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_2$ such that $P_\nu = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{G}} P_\sigma$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{J}_1$ be the unique multi-index such that $(\kappa, \sigma) \in \mathcal{J}$. Then $\mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(S_\sigma) = \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(S_\kappa)$ and therefore Lemma 3.7 yields that $\mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(P_\sigma) = 0$. Here we use that $P_\kappa P_\sigma = 0$ by assumption. Thus,

$$\mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(P_\nu) = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}\alpha(P_\sigma) = 0.$$

On the other hand, $\alpha(P_\mu) \leq \alpha(\mathbf{1}_w) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}$ by Proposition 3.9. Therefore $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu)) \leq \mathbf{1}_{\alpha(w)}$ and consequently $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))\alpha(P_\nu) = 0$. □

Remark 3.14. Let $\mu, \nu \in W_2$ be non-empty, orthogonal multi-indices such that $\min(|\mu|, |\nu|) \geq 2$. It is easy to see that there exists $w \in V$ with the property that $P_\mu \leq \mathbf{1}_w$ and $P_\nu w P_\nu = 0$.

In general, a unitary $w \in V$ as in Remark 3.14 cannot be chosen inside the Thompson group F or T. However, the following observation shows that this is still possible for many choices of $(\mu, \nu) \in W_2 \times W_2$. In the following Lemma 3.15, we write $\mu \prec \nu$ to indicate that μ precedes ν in the lexicographic order. Recall that for $k \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$, we denote by $i(k) \in W_2^k$ the multi-index of length k consisting only of i's.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $\mu, \nu \in W_2$ be non-empty, orthogonal multi-indices with $\mu \prec \nu$. Assume that there exists $\kappa \in W_2$ with $\mu \prec \kappa \prec \nu$ such that κ is orthogonal to both μ and ν. If $\nu \neq 2(k)$ for any $k \geq 1$, then there exists some $w \in F$ such that $P_\mu \leq \mathbf{1}_w$ and $P_\nu w P_\nu = 0$. Similarly, if $\mu \neq 1(k)$ for any $k \geq 1$, then there exists some $w \in F$ such that $P_\nu \leq \mathbf{1}_w$ and $P_\mu w P_\mu = 0$.*

Proof. Assume first that $\nu \neq 2(k)$ for any $k \geq 1$. We find projections $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \in \mathcal{D}_2$ such that

1) $P_\mu + P_\nu + \sum_{i=1}^4 p_i = 1$;
2) $p_1 = 0$ or $p = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} P_{\eta_j^{(1)}}$ for some multi-indices $\eta_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \eta_{n_1}^{(1)} \prec \mu$;
3) $0 \neq p_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} P_{\eta_j^{(2)}}$ for some multi-indices $\mu \prec \eta_1^{(2)}, \ldots, \eta_{n_2}^{(2)} \prec \nu$;

4) $0 \neq p_3 = \sum_{j=1}^{n_3} P_{\eta_j^{(3)}}$ for some multi-indices $\nu \prec \eta_1^{(3)}, \dots, \eta_{n_3}^{(3)}$;
5) $0 \neq p_4 = \sum_{j=1}^{n_4} P_{\eta_j^{(4)}}$ such that $\eta_i^{(3)} \prec \eta_j^{(4)}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n_3$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_4$.

Then one checks that there is some $w \in F$ with

i) $p_1 + P_\mu \leq \mathbf{1}_w$;
ii) $wp_2 = (p_2 + P_\nu)w$;
iii) $wP_\nu = p_3 w$;
iv) $w(p_3 + p_4) = p_4 w$.

In particular, it follows that $P_\mu \leq \mathbf{1}_w$ and $P_\nu w P_\nu = P_\nu p_3 w = 0$.

If $\mu \neq 1(k)$ for any $k \geq 1$, then a similar proof shows that there exists some $w \in F$ such that $P_\nu \leq \mathbf{1}_w$ and $P_\mu w P_\mu = 0$. □

Lemma 3.16. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_2)$. Then $\alpha(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2$ if and only if for all $\mu, \nu \in W_2$ non-empty, orthogonal multi-indices it holds that $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\nu)) = 0$.*

Proof. As the "if"-part is trivial, we only proof the "only if"-direction. Let $\mu \in W_2$ be a non-empty multi-index and find $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_r \in W_2$ non-empty such that $P_\mu + \sum_{i=1}^r P_{\kappa_i} = 1$. Hence,

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu)) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_{\kappa_i})) = 1.$$

Multiplying this equation with $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))$ and employing the assumption, we obtain that $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu)) = \Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))^2$. This shows that $\alpha(P_\mu)$ belongs to the multiplicative domain of $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}$. As $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a faithful conditional expectation onto $\mathcal{D}_2$, its multiplicative domain equals $\mathcal{D}_2$. This concludes the proof. □

Lemma 3.17. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_2)$. If $\alpha(V) \subseteq V$ then $\alpha(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.13 combined with Remark 3.14 shows that $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))\alpha(P_\nu) = 0$ for all $\mu, \nu \in W_2$ non-empty, orthogonal multi-indices such that $\max(|\mu|, |\nu|) \geq 2$. However, this implies that $\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\nu)) = 0$ for all $\mu, \nu \in W_2$ non-empty and orthogonal. The conclusion now follows from Lemma 3.16. □

Although, at this point, it is not clear whether the same conclusion holds if we only assume that $\alpha(F) \subseteq V$, we can at least say the following.

Proposition 3.18. *Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ be such that $\alpha(F) \subseteq V$. Then for any $\mu, \nu, \kappa \in W_2$ non-empty, mutually orthogonal multi-indices, we have*

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\mu))\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\nu))\Phi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha(P_\kappa)) = 0.$$

Proof. The claim follows directly from Lemma 3.13 and Lemma 3.15, as at least one of the pairs $(\mu, \nu), (\mu, \kappa)$ and (ν, κ) satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.15. □

The remaining three results of this paper, Proposition 3.19, Proposition 3.20 and Theorem 3.21 below, give information about those unitaries $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ for which $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq V$, $\lambda_u(T) \subseteq V$ and $\lambda_u(V) \subseteq V$, respectively.

Proposition 3.19. *Let $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ be such that $\lambda_u(F) \subseteq V$. Then $u \in V$ if and only if $\lambda_u(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2$ and $\lambda_u(S_1 S_2^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2$.*

Proof. If $u \in V$ then clearly $\lambda_u(\mathcal{V}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2$, which shows that the "if"-direction is trivial. For the converse, assume that $\lambda_u(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2$ and $\lambda_u(S_1 S_2^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2$. We first show that $\lambda_u(\mathcal{V}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2$. For this, it is enough to show that $\lambda_u(S_\mu S_\nu^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2$ for all non-empty multi-indices $\mu, \nu \in W_2$.

Assume first that $\mu, \nu \in W_2$ are non-empty multi-indices with the property that there exists some partial isometry $v \in \mathcal{V}_2$ such that $w = S_\mu S_\nu^* + v \in F$. This is exactly the case if one of the following three cases is satisfied:

(i) $(\mu, \nu) = (1(k), 1(\ell))$ for some $k, \ell \geq 1$;
(ii) $(\mu, \nu) = (2(k), 2(\ell))$ for some $k, \ell \geq 1$;
(iii) $1(k) \neq \mu \neq 2(k)$ and $1(\ell) \neq \nu \neq 2(\ell)$ for all $k, \ell \geq 1$.

In either of these cases,

$$\lambda_u(S_\mu S_\nu^*) = \lambda_u(P_\mu w) = \lambda_u(P_\mu)\lambda_u(w) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}_2) \cdot V \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2.$$

Let us now check the cases where neither of the conditions (i)-(iii) are satisfied. By assumption,

$$\lambda_u(S_{21(k-1)} S_{1(k)}^*) = \lambda_u(S_2 S_1^*)\lambda_u(P_{1(k)}) \in \mathcal{V}_2 \cdot \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2$$

for every $k \geq 1$. Using that $\mathcal{V}_2$ is $*$-invariant, it follows from a similar argument that $\lambda_u(S_{12(k-1)} S_{2(k)}^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2$ for every $k \geq 1$. Now let $\mu \in W_2$ be a non-empty multi-index such that $1(\ell) \neq \mu \neq 2(\ell)$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Then $(\mu, 12(k))$ satisfies (iii) for all $k \geq 1$ and we obtain that

$$\lambda_u(S_\mu S_{2(k)}^*) = \lambda_u(S_\mu S_{12(k)}^*)\lambda_u(S_{12(k)} S_{2(k+1)}^*)\lambda_u(S_{2(k+1)} S_{2(k)}^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2.$$

Similarly, $\lambda_u(S_\mu S_{1(k)}^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2$ for all $k \geq 1$. Furthermore, this in turn shows that

$$\lambda_u(S_{2(\ell)} S_{1(k)}^*) = \lambda_u(S_{2(\ell)} S_{12}^*)\lambda_u(S_{12} S_{1(k)}^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2$$

for all $k, \ell \geq 1$. Consequently, $\lambda_u(S_{1(k)} S_{2(\ell)}^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2$ for all $k, \ell \geq 1$ as well. This covers all cases where neither of the conditions (i)-(iii) are satisfied and $\lambda_u(\mathcal{V}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2$ follows.

This now implies that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\lambda_u(S_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_u(S_i)\lambda_u(S_j S_j^*) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_u(S_i S_j S_j^*) \in \mathcal{V}_2.$$

Thus,

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \lambda_u(S_i) S_i^* \in \mathcal{V}_2 \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2) = V.$$

This concludes the proof. □

Replacing the Thompson group F with T in Proposition 3.19 above leads to the following simplified condition.

Proposition 3.20. *Let $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ be such that $\lambda_u(T) \subseteq V$. Then $u \in V$ if and only if $\lambda_u(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2$.*

Proof. We only have to prove the "only if"-direction. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$ be such that $\lambda_u(T) \subseteq V$ and $\lambda_u(\mathcal{D}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2$. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, there clearly exists a partial isometry $v_j \in \mathcal{V}_2$ such that $w_j = S_i S_j S_j^* + v_j \in T$. By assumption, it holds for $i = 1, 2$ that

$$\lambda_u(S_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_u(S_i)\lambda_u(S_j S_j^*) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_u(S_i S_j S_j^*) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \lambda_u(w_j)\lambda_u(P_j) \in \mathcal{V}_2.$$

Hence we conclude that

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \lambda_u(S_i) S_i^* \in \mathcal{V}_2 \cap \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2) = V,$$

which finishes the proof. □

Now, we are ready to give the following interesting result.

Theorem 3.21. *Let $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$. Then $\lambda_u(V) \subseteq V$ if and only if $u \in V$.*

Proof. This is an immediate corollary to Lemma 3.17 and Proposition 3.20. □

References

[1] S. Barlak and M. Ramirez-Solano, in preparation.
[2] J. M. Belk and K. S. Brown, *Forest diagrams for elements of Thompson's group F*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **15** (2005), 815–850.
[3] J.-C. Birget, *The groups of Richard Thompson and complexity*, International Conference on Semigroups and Groups in honor of the 65th birthday of Prof. John Rhodes. Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **14** (2004), 569–626.
[4] J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd and W. R. Parry, *Introductory notes on Richard Thompson's groups*, Enseign. Math. (2) **42** (1996), 215–256.
[5] R. Conti, M. Rørdam and W. Szymański, *Endomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_n$ which preserve the canonical UHF-subalgebra*, J. Funct. Anal. **259** (2010), 602–617.
[6] R. Conti and W. Szymański, *Labeled trees and localized automorphisms of the Cuntz algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), 5847–5870.
[7] J. Cuntz, *Simple C^*-algebras generated by isometries*, Commun. Math. Phys. **57** (1977), 173–185.
[8] J. Cuntz, *Automorphisms of certain simple C^*-algebras*, in *Quantum fields – algebras, processes*, ed. L. Streit, 187–196, Springer, 1980.
[9] S. Haagerup, U. Haagerup and M. Ramirez-Solano, *A computational approach to the Thompson group F*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **25** (2015), 381–432.
[10] U. Haagerup and K. K. Olesen, *Non-inner amenability of the Thompson groups T and V*, arXiv:1609.05086.
[11] T. Hayashi, *On normalizers of C^*-subalgebras in the Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_n$*, J. Operator Theory **69** (2013), 525–533.
[12] T. Hayashi, J. H. Hong and W. Szymański, *On endomorphisms of the Cuntz algebra which preserve the canonical UHF-subalgebra, II,* J. Funct. Anal. **272** (2017), 759–775.
[13] G. Higman, *Finitely presented infinite simple groups*, Notes on Pure Math. **8**, Australian National Univ., Canberra, 1974.
[14] V. Nekrashevych, *Cuntz-Pimsner algebras of group actions*, J. Operator Theory **52** (2004), 223–249.
[15] S. C. Power, *Homology for operator algebras, III. Partial isometry homotopy and triangular algebras*, New York J. Math. **4** (1998), 35–56.

Selçuk Barlak
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
The University of Southern Denmark
Campusvej 55, DK–5230 Odense M, Denmark
E-mail: barlak@imada.sdu.dk

Jeong Hee Hong
Department of Data Information
Korea Maritime and Ocean University
Busan 49112, South Korea
E-mail: hongjh@kmou.ac.kr

Wojciech Szymański
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
The University of Southern Denmark
Campusvej 55, DK–5230 Odense M, Denmark
E-mail: szymanski@imada.sdu.dk